IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

RYSTA LEONA SUSMAN, both)	
individually and as Legal Guardian of)	
SHANE ALLEN LOVELAND, et al.,)	
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
) C:	ase No. 8:18-cv-00127
v.)	
)	
THE GOODYEAR TIRE & RUBBER)	
COMPANY,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

GOODYEAR'S SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF MOTION IN LIMINE TO EXCLUDE EVIDENCE PURSUANT TO THE SELF CRITICAL ANALYSIS PRIVILEGE

The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company ("Goodyear"), by and through undersigned counsel, hereby submits its Supplemental Brief in Support of Motion in Limine to Exclude Evidence Pursuant to the Self Critical Analysis Privilege. In support, Goodyear states as follows:

1. The elements of the self-critical analysis privilege under Ohio law are:

[F]irst, the information must result from a critical self-analysis undertaken by the party seeking protection; second, the public must have a strong interest in preserving the free flow of the type of information sought; finally, the information must be of the type whose flow would be curtailed if discovery were allowed.

State, ex rel. Celebrezze, v. CECOS Internatl., Inc., 583 N.E.2d 1118, 1120 (Ct. App. Ohio 1990).

- 2. By way of supplement, Goodyear presents one excerpt from a deposition given by Beale Robinson, a Goodyear employee, in the case of *Garcia v. Kelly-Springfield, et.al.*, Case No. 99-1611-CIV-T-17B (M.D. Fla.) on December 5, 2001.
- 3. Mr. Robinson's testimony is that that the "Tread Throw Investigation", which is the subject of Goodyear's Motion in Limine to Exclude Evidence Pursuant to the Self Critical Analysis

Privilege, was undertaken by Goodyear as a "self-critical examination within the company" performed "for the purposes of quality control." (Robinson Depo. at 361:9-15, attached as Exhibit A.)

4. Whether Goodyear's "Tread Throw Investigation" was an internal analysis voluntarily performed by Goodyear for the purposes of evaluating quality control should not be in dispute given that Plaintiffs' tire expert, David Southwell, agrees with that characterization in his expert report. (ECF No. 171 at p. 9.) Nonetheless, Goodyear submits this additional testimony for the record and in support of the first element of the self-critical analysis privilege noted above.

WHEREFORE, for each of the foregoing reasons and those previously stated, Goodyear respectfully requests that the Court grant the Motion in Limine to Exclude Evidence Pursuant to the Self Critical Analysis Privilege.

GREENSFELDER, HEMKER & GALE, P.C.

By: /s/ Edward S. Bott, Jr.
Edward S. Bott, Jr.
Clark W. Hedger
Juliane M. Rodriguez
10 South Broadway, Suite 2000
St. Louis, MO 63102
(314) 241-9090
Fax: (314) 345-5465
esb@greensfelder.com
ch1@greensfelder.com
jrodriguez@greensfelder.com

AND

BAIRD HOLM LLP Jennifer D. Tricker (NE# 23022) 1700 Farnam Street, Suite 1500 Omaha, NE 68102-2068 (402) 344-0500 jtricker@bairdholm.com

Attorneys for The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

I hereby certify that this brief complies with NECivR 7.1(d)(3) and further certify that the word count function was applied to include all text, including the caption, headings, footnotes, and quotations. This document was prepared using Microsoft Word 2010 and contains 602 words.

Bott, Jr.	F	S	ward	Edv	/s/
-----------	---	---	------	-----	-----

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a true and accurate copy of the foregoing was filed with the Clerk of the Court and served upon all attorneys of record using the CM/ECF system this 12th day of February, 2020.

Kyle W. Farrar KASTER, LYNCH, FARRAR & BALL, LLP 1010 Lamar, Suite 1600 Houston, TX 77002 kyle@fbtrial.com

Paul E. Godlewski SCHWEBEL, GOETZ & SIEBEN, P.A. 80 South 8th Center 5120 IDS Center Minneapolis, MN 54402 pgodlewski@schwebel.com

Michael F. Coyle FRASER, STRYKER LAW FIRM 409 South 17th Street Suite 500, Energy Plaza Omaha, NE 68102 mcoyle@fraserstryker.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs